

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO | |
|---|------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/082,984 | 02/25/2002 | Yukinobu Konishi | 542-007-3 | 7004 | |
| 4955 | 7590 06/23/2004 | | EXAM | EXAMINER | |
| WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & | | | WANG, GEORGE Y | | |
| ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 755 MAIN STREET, PO BOX 224 | | | 2871 | | |
| MONROE, C | MONROE, CT 06468 | | DATE MAILED: 06/23/2004 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 10/082,984 | KONISHI ET AL. | | | | | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | George Y. Wang | 2871 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communicati n appears on the c ver sheet with the c rrespondence address | | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 04 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control | ation. A proper repl n places the applica | y to a ition in | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail | g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approperture of the fee. The apporture or the final region or the final regions. | on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | | |
| (c) \(\sum \) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | | |
| NOTE: | !/-\· | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | eparate, timely filed | amendment | | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | o issues which were | e newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | and an | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | , | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6</u> . | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | / | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr | oved or b)☐ disapproved by t | he Examiner. | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | -1/ | $\overline{}$ | | | | |
| 10. ☐ Other: | Super Teo | ROBERT H. KIM IVISORY PATENT EX CHNOLOGY CENTER | AMINER 2800 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant mainly argues that there is no motivation to combine the Fujihara and Nishikawa references because the "external signal" in Nishikawa is unlike the external signal in Claim 1 in that is is "not intended to actuate a TFT by changing voltage." However, Examiner notes that nowhere is this language found in the claims to provide any patentable weight. As such, Applicant's arguments do not place the application in condition for allowance..